

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 6, 17, and 21 have been amended. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 1,999,783 (“Riesbol”).

Riesbol does not disclose the subject matter of amended independent Claim 1. More specifically, Riesbol does not disclose a pre-formed concrete section including a plurality of weldments connected to and spaced along the first side; and a first leg and a second leg projecting from the bottom surface, a distance, in a direction substantially parallel to the deck, from the center of the first leg to the center of the second leg being more than two times greater than the distance from the first side to the center of the first leg.

Riesbol does not disclose a plurality of weldments connected to and spaced along the first side.

In addition, the teachings of Riesbol is limited to concrete forms for concrete joist floors, therefore the span between the legs is limited. Furthermore, the concrete forms are positioned in place where the concrete will remain (i.e., it is not transported or moved after being formed) and then they are filled with the concrete. Later, the forms are removed and the concrete slab remains in position. Therefore, Riesbol does not disclose a pre-formed concrete section.

For at least these reasons, Riesbol does not teach or suggest the subject matter of Claim 1. Accordingly, independent Claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2-5 depend from Claim 1, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons Claim 1 is allowable.

The Examiner rejected Claims 6-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Riesbol in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,168,771 (“Nelson”).

Riesbol does not disclose the subject matter of amended independent Claim 6. As noted above, Riesbol does not disclose a pre-formed concrete section including a deck having a plurality of weldments connected to and spaced along the first side.

Nelson does not cure the deficiencies of Riesbol. Nelson does not disclose a pre-formed concrete section including a deck having a plurality of weldments connected to and spaced along the first side. Rather, Nelson discloses an adjustable wing T form having a plurality of L-shaped frames 11 and 12. The frame 12 is mounted to a carriage 55 that moves

the frame 12 into position according to a desired size of the beam 90. As illustrated in Figs. 3-4, the beam 90 includes wings having a varying thickness.

In addition, the references cannot be combined. The Examiner indicates on page 4 of the Office action that

In view of Nelson, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Riesbol's pre-formed concrete section with tapered end outer portions for providing a clearance for bridge pathway construction.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Riesbol discloses a channel form that interconnects with a flat plate 39 as illustrated in Fig. 11 and used to create a concrete floor. The channel forms require a supporting surface for proper usage when the concrete is poured into the channel forms. The concrete fills the channel form and the flat plate 39 to form a flat surface 10 with beams 11. The flat surface includes a consistent thickness across the span of the flat plate 39. Applicant respectfully contends that the forms of Riesbol are not suitable for bridge design. Bridges require that the deck not be flat for water drainage purposes. Whereas, the concrete deck that would be formed with the Riesbol form is flat.

For at least these reasons, Riesbol and Nelson do not teach or suggest the subject matter of Claim 6. Accordingly, independent Claim 6 is allowable. Claims 7-16 depend from Claim 6, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons Claim 6 is allowable.

Riesbol does not teach or suggest the subject matter of amended independent Claim 17 for at least the reasons noted above with respect to Claim 6.

For at least these reasons, Riesbol and Nelson do not teach or suggest the subject matter of Claim 17. Accordingly, independent Claim 17 is allowable. Claims 18-20 depend from Claim 17, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons Claim 17 is allowable.

The Examiner rejected Claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0140590 ("Lancelot").

Lancelot does not disclose the subject matter of amended independent Claim 21. More specifically, Lancelot does not disclose a concrete section assembly comprising at least two pre-formed concrete sections, each section being a unitary construction and comprising a plurality of weldments connected to and spaced along the first side and the second side; a first

outer portion extending generally from the first leg toward the first side, the thickness of the deck generally decreasing as the first outer portion extends outwardly from the first leg toward the first side; and a second outer portion extending generally from the second leg toward the second side, the thickness of the deck generally decreasing as the second outer portion extends outwardly from the second leg toward the second side; and wherein the at least two sections are connected to one another via the weldments with the deck of each section being substantially co-planar and the second side of the deck of a first section being connected to the first side of the deck of a second section adjoining the first section, the distance, in a direction substantially parallel to the deck of each section, from the center of the first leg to the second leg of the first section is greater than the distance from the center of the second leg of the first section to the center of the first leg of the second section adjoining the first section.

Rather, Lancelot discloses a flange connector 10 for joining adjacent concrete structural members 12. The member 12 includes a load bearing slab 14 and two flanged edges 16. There is no disclosure in Lancelot regarding the thickness of the flanged edges 16. In addition, the figures of Lancelot illustrate that the thickness of the flanged edges 16 does not vary. Lancelot also does not disclose the distance between the legs of the concrete structure.

For at least these reasons, Lancelot does not teach or suggest the subject matter of Claim 21. Accordingly, independent Claim 21 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, entry of this Amendment and allowance of Claims 1-21 is respectfully requested. The undersigned is available for telephone consultation during normal business hours.

Respectfully submitted,

/julie a. haut/

Julie A. Haut
Reg. No. 51,789

Docket No. 049220-9006-00
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue
Suite 3300
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108
414.271.6560